

REMARKS

This response is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action mailed on January 29, 2007. In view of the following amendment and discussion, the Applicants believe that all claims are in allowable form.

IN THE DRAWINGS

The drawings are objected to because they do not show the adjustable pins recited in claim 48, e.g., Figure 4 does not show how the pins may be adjusted.

Applicants have amended Figure 4 to correct the position of the pin 236a to add the distance "d" and to provide arrows next to pin 236a to illustrate that at least one of the pins 236a and 236b is movable so that the distance "d" may be adjusted as described in paragraph 0034. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

ALLOWABLE CLAIMS

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of claims 37-38 if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, and to include all limitations in the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 37 has been cancelled. Instead, as set forth below, claim 23 has been amended to incorporate the features from claim 37 and all its intervening claims, and to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph - Claims 23-60

Claims 23-60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, claim 23, which recites "during substrate transfer", is deemed to be indefinite because the substrate has not been set forth as being transferred.

Claims 24, 31-33, 35-37, 39-41, 43-47 and 49-61 have been cancelled, and their rejection is therefore moot.

Claim 23 has been amended to recite the robot as "adapted for substrate transfer." As such, claim 23 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 25-30, 34, 38, 42 and 48 depend, either directly or indirectly from claim 23. Therefore, these claims are also patentable under 35 U.S.C. §112.

35 U.S.C. §103 - Claims 23-36 and 39-61

Claims 23-36 and 39-61 stand rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sundar* in view of United States Patent No. 4,411,576 issued October 25, 1983 to *Smith, et al.* (hereinafter referred to as *Smith*).

Claims 24, 31-33, 35-37, 39-41, 43-47 and 49-61 have been cancelled, and their rejection is therefore moot.

Claim 23 has been amended by incorporating the features of claim 37 and its intervening claims. Thus, the amended claim 23 is now patentable under U.S.C. §103(a). Since claims 25-30, 34, 38, 42 and 48 depend, either directly or indirectly from claim 23, these claims are also patentable under U.S.C. §103(a).


CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants submit that all claims now pending are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that any unresolved issues still exist, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Keith Taboada at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

March 29, 2007
Date



Keith P. TABOADA
Attorney Reg. No. 45,150
(732) 530-9404

RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION
Serial No. 10/758,753
Page 9 of 9

Patterson & Sheridan, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue
Suite 100
Shrewsbury, NJ 07702